



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the confusion caused by the Norman Conquest must have hastened it. The same may be said of Mätzner in his *Englische Grammatik*. In speaking of the genitive, however, (and the two cases are in most respects parallel), Mätzner says: "The sign of the genitive singular *s* originally belongs to the singular of masculine and neuter forms of the strong substantives. In English it was early transferred to all substantives in the singular, also to feminines. In this the English agrees with the Danish and Swedish, the former of which has nearly unified the declension of masculine and feminine nouns" (cf. Mätzner *Eng. Gram.* I, 254). The silence of these scholars in regard to a matter of so great importance is a strong proof that they did not consider it necessary to resort to outside influence to explain what in itself was a legitimate result of the tendency of the language, especially observed in Anglo-Saxon, a tendency at work as far back as history carries us. I fear the idea of French influence originated on English (and American) soil and has found its only advocates there; it reminds us very much of the development of the genitive singular from the possessive pronoun *his*. And yet England has produced the most outspoken defender of the legitimate development of plurals in *s*. Oliphant in his *Old and Middle English* seems to have made it a matter of conscience to antagonize the idea of French influence wherever possible. In commenting on the Lindisfarne Gospels (950 A.D.) he says: "The genitive singular and nominative plural in *es* swallowed up the other forms. Thus we came back to the Aryan pattern in all but plurals like *oxen*. There is a wrong notion abroad that the German plural in *en* is more venerable than the English plural in *es*." (cf. examples *ibid.* 106). Again, p. 119 (1119 A.D.): "We should cast aside all the old notions about our grammar owing its debasement to the Norman Conquest. Rich Kent, though overrun with foreigners, held fast to the Old English endings down to 1340, long after the greater part of the land had dropped them; Yorkshire had got rid of many of her endings long before the Normans came. It was not these last conquerors that substituted the plural ending *es* for the old plural in *en*; this *en* with its genitive in *ene*, lasted until 1340 in Kent." Further on, p. 346: "Some say that

the French ending in *es* had great influence in making England adopt *es* for the plural ending of all her nouns; so far is this from the truth, that in the present piece the poet goes out of his way to alter the French *freres* into *freren*, the old plural form to which Southern England steadily clung."

Even a casual glance at Siever's *Paradigmen zur Deutschen Grammatik* will be sufficient to convince one that all the declensions of the German languages are fast assimilating themselves to the *a*-declension. If we remember, moreover, that not only the masc. *a*-stems, but also the masc. *i*-stems (they had already passed in the plural to the *a*-decl.) and the masc. cons. stems (like *faeder*, *feōnd*, *freōnd*) formed their plural in *as*, we cannot but conclude that the analogy of these Anglo-Saxon words would be far more powerful than French influence, especially when we add that the French itself was only in the transition stage from its older declension to the modern. If the truth be told, I believe that English exerted more influence upon the French plural in *s* than *vice versa*.

S. PRIMER.

College of Charleston.

Kinder und Hausmärchen der Gebrüder Grimm, selected and edited with English notes, glossary and a grammatical appendix, by W. H. VAN DER SMISSEN, M. A., lecturer on German in University College, Toronto. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1885. pp. text 65, total 190, 75c.

This book is intended as a first reader and a drill-book in grammatical forms and constructions, and its editor is confident that "the charming simplicity of diction and thought in these tales renders them peculiarly fit for beginners in the German language to read."

It surely is a prime requisite, but by no means a simple task to select such prose as will arouse the interest of the student and command his respect for the language he is studying. But whatever charm *Märchen* may have for very young children and for mature minds, youth usually finds in them little to enjoy and much to ridicule.

Moreover, one who has had experience in teaching German prose-composition knows

how difficult it is to correct the perverted ideas as to the use of words and constructions, that are acquired by students whose early reading has consisted largely of poetry and fairy-tales. Such a teacher will surely hesitate before putting into the hands of a beginner a book commencing: "Einem reichen Manne dem ward seine Frau krank."

But having chosen his material, the editor has, undeniably, treated it in an unusually satisfactory way. The notes and vocabulary are, on the whole, very good and must be of real use to the learner. Light is thrown upon difficult passages, and matters too often vaguely stated receive clear and scholarly treatment.

There are, however, one or two decided exceptions to this. In the vocabulary an attempt has been made to mark the accent, both primary (') and secondary (^). But while the accent is carefully marked on *Föder*, *Händler*, and scores of words as simple, the learner is given no assistance in the case of *Hundegebell*, *Abendbrot*, *glücklicherweise*, *allerlei*, *Almosen*, and many as puzzling. Compare moreover such markings as *auseinanderfun* with *Fëueránmachen* and *Frëiherr* with *fúchsroth* (but *rot*) and *Frühjahr*. What learner, seeing *dahëim* accented on the last syllable and *dafür*, the word just above, unaccented, would not infer a difference between the two? With the exception of a few *ü*'s, no umlauts are accented; and while some pages have nearly every word accented, others have none and the seven pages from *jemand* to *mit* are favored with but three accents.

Furthermore, in the notes and more especially in the glossary of this book, there is not a little material whose only value is such as it may possess as curious bits of information. We are told, for instance, that *I* is "the ninth letter of the alphabet and the third vowel"; *angst* is stated to be "an adjective, indeclinable, incomparable, and used only as a predicate," and, to crown all, its one syllable is accented.

Under *Stube* is given "dim. *Stübchen*, n. [hence "*Stoup*", from the Dutch]." The *Stübchen* that is the diminutive of *Stube* has nothing to do with *Stoup*. It is the unusual word *Stübchen*, "a beer-measure," that is connected with English *Stoup*, "a vessel." Moreover, this latter word is not "from the Dutch" but from M. E. *Stope*, O. E. *Stéap*, "a cup".

It is *Stoop*, "a door *Step*", German *Stufe*, that we have from the Dutch settlers in New York. Lexicographical information of this kind even when correct, as it usually is in this volume, is quite out of place in an elementary text book.

The volume is printed in Roman characters and its mechanical execution is excellent.

GEORGE HEMPL.

Sur la Versification Anglo-Normande par
JOHAN VISING. Doc. ès Let. Upsala R.
Almqvist & J. Wiksell.

Mr. Johan Vising is not a stranger in the field of Anglo-Norman Literature. His Thesis for the Doctorat, "Études sur le Dialecte Anglo-Normand du XII^e Siècle," attracted the attention of those interested in the subject by the careful and thorough investigation of three Anglo-Norman works: *Voyage de Brandon*, *L'Estorie des Engleis de Gaimar* and *La Chronique de Fantosme*, in regard to the Manuscripts, the Versification and the Phonetics.

In the present work, Mr. Vising considers only the Anglo-Norman versification and discusses the theories of Messrs. Suchier, Koch and ten Brink on that subject.

Mr. Suchier, in his pamphlet on Mr. Atkinson's "Vie de Saint Auban," was the first—in 1876—to advance the theory of a Germanic phenomenon of "Auftact" in Anglo-Norman versification. In 1879, answering the criticisms of Mr. Koschwitz, he defined his position in an article "Versbildung der Anglo-Normannen," contributed to *Anglia*.

Mr. Suchier is certainly "trop sûr de son fait" and although his theory has been partly adopted by Mr. Koch (Edition des *Poèmes de Chardri*) and by Mr. ten Brink in his 'Geschichte der Englischen Literatur,' these views have found no echo among the French philologists and have been contradicted in Germany by Messrs. Koschwitz, Rose and Tobler.

Mr. Vising sees only three ways by which the English influence on the Anglo-Norman Poetry could have made itself felt.

1. The Anglo-Norman poets knew English and borrowed some traits of its versification.
2. Poets of English origin have written French poems with the metrical peculiarities of their tongue.